FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE
January 8, 2013
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening[1]

Committee Chair, Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP), welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the November meeting summary.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Change Package

Agency Presentation

J.D. Dowell, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) provided a presentation on the proposed changes to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) change package. J.D. noted that the 45-day public comment period began December 10, 2012 and ends on January 24, 2013. There are three milestone changes to D/H, F & N areas. DOE plans to extend the original M-16-00A deadline (December 31, 2012) to March 31, 2017 to include 154 waste sites that were identified. J.D. noted that all of the 154 additional work sites identified are in the Waste Information Data System (WIDS).

J.D. noted that for B/C Area, M-15-00D, the original due date was December 31, 2012. The TPA agencies are proposing to extend the 100 B/C decision documents schedule to December 15, 2016 to study the chromium sources and enable collection of additional groundwater data for the cleanup decision. The agencies are proposing a six-month extension (to June 30, 2013) for the 100-N document to avoid releasing too many documents for public comment simultaneously.

The agencies are proposing to extend the K East Reactor interim safe storage date to December 31, 2019 from July 31, 2014. The agencies want to do more characterization work and evaluate additional soil sampling data. In addition, the agencies propose to align the completion dates to one date for both the KE and KW reactors (M-93-00).

[1] Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

J.D. noted that the proposed TPA change package would not affect the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit. Soil remediation under the 324 hot cells will go into the RCRA permit. The agencies are proposing to extend the 324 building milestone date from September 30, 2012 to September 30, 2014 in order to address unanticipated, significant soil contamination due to leakage. This will defer some near-term funding in this area to future schedules and adds additional required funding for this work. J.D. noted that waste at 324 building is high rad material, not transuranic (TRU) waste. Near-term funding will be used to fund other work; this work will add about $10M to out-year budgets. He suggested a good time for DOE to come back to the committee to status them on this work would be in about a year when design work would be about 30% complete.

J.D. noted that for the Canyon Areas, M-85-00, the agencies are requesting to extend the interim milestone from March 31, 2013 to September 30, 2022 in order to incorporate the Optimization Study and lessons learned from the U-Plant Canyon disposition, validate the approach, and set a realistic schedule. The schedule is to complete U canyon remediation by 2018 and to cap it by 2021.

Regulator Perspective

John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted Ecology's support for the TPA change package. John noted that 324 building will continue to be a concern, and Ecology will continue to put pressure on DOE to meet their deadline.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: The presentation slide on 324 building stated DOE moved 12,000 curies of radiation from B-Cell. Where was it moved? What was it?

> *R: [Ecology] The radiation was moved from the cell itself. This was mostly completed about two years ago.*

C. The State of Oregon in general supports the TPA change package, although resists the lengthy delays on many of these important projects, and in particular supports additional water characterization and source removal. It would save precious budget money if investigations indicate that further remediation would not be necessary.

Q: What is the tool shown in the presentation that looks like it is removing soil?

> *R: [DOE] The tool shown is used to reach inside of B-Cell to clean the B-Cell liner.*

Q: One concern I have with 324 building is that we have to maintain facilities and bleed water lines. Are there concerns with water line leaks?

> *R: [DOE] DOE is always concerned with water line leaks. DOE will continue to monitor these lines. The system is old and beyond its design life; may have future leaks but plan to mitigate them quickly. From a mitigation standpoint, there will not be an extreme situation with driving waste into groundwater.*

R: [Ecology] The line that leaked previously was old. The fire protection system is comprised of newer piping (1980s), which is why there is now less concern for leakage.

Q: The first leak was the older carbon steel water line on the southern perimeter of the property. Will that line remain operational?

R: [Ecology] Yes, that line will remain operational.

Q: What types of evaluations are done on the water lines, and are they camera inspections?

R: [Ecology] Internal inspections have not been conducted.

Q: Can you confirm that the boreholes at 100-K East for soil-sampling data will be turned into wells for groundwater monitoring?

R: [Ecology] It is unlikely that this will be the case. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is determining whether or not an interim cap can be provided as a protective remedy. The original plan was to remove K-East reactor. K-East reactor will not be removed in the near-term due to cost and risk.

R: [DOE] There may be a range of options between using an interim cap and removing the reactor. The agencies agree that further samples are needed in order to collect more information.

Q: Are final Record of Decision (ROD) cleanup levels already determined?

R: [EPA] Milestones are defined for all response actions for all soil sites. EPA does not have to redefine milestones once the RODs are in place, and until EPA completes a ROD, schedules are not set. Interim action cleanup levels and what EPA thinks will be final cleanup levels will be very similar. At this point, EPA thinks it will not affect the final analysis. Interim action RODs are used for soils and groundwater, and cleanup levels set in the interim action RODs are conservative, particularly for the 100 areas. This is not a means of delaying work. All on-the-ground fieldwork is ongoing.

Q: What work in the 200 Area will be delayed due to the 154 newly identified waste areas?

R: [DOE] The 154 waste areas are identified in the draft change package and WIDS. These waste sites were discovered throughout the course of the 100 Area remediation work done by Washington Closure but are not in their contract. Nothing will be impacted given budgets are not impacted. This work should not impact the Central Plateau work; these are two different contracts. The fiscal year 2015 budget is currently unknown. Near-term funding for the 324 building will be deferred to the future and require additional funding (est. $10M). Near-term budgets that would have been used for this work will be used to fund other work. The additional work required for the 154 sites, will be put into the WCH contract. The cost will be in the tens of millions of dollars, not hundreds of billions of dollars.

R: [EPA] EPA disagrees with DOE on this issue and believes that there will be a tremendous effect on Central Plateau cleanup in the present. The Central Plateau cleanup deadline is currently set for 2024. This is unrealistic. A new scope of work will be completed before 2020. Central Plateau cleanup will likely be completed between 2035 and 2040.

Q: Is DOE going to extend the River Corridor contract, or has that already been done?

R: [DOE] The contract has not already been extended. It is a ten-year contract, and DOE is evaluating what to do at the end of ten years.

Q: Was there any discussion about approaching Congress for additional funding for work only on 324 building?

R: [DOE] DOE is unable to request money outside of the budget process. DOE keeps senators and Congressmen informed on work progress. If the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) makes a strong recommendation, it could help us.

C: It is a basic tenant of TPA that budget is not a reason to delay. DOE is legally required to request a compliance budget every year. It would be appropriate for RAP to develop advice particular to the 324 building.

C: Mentioning lack of funding in HAB advice will not do well in Congress. Every project blames delays on lack of funding. There is no blame for things that were unplanned or unknown, as was the case with the 154 identified waste areas.

C: I have a hard time thinking of this as a good news change package. I think it is good that the dates are more realistic. The public perception of the 2015 Vision is off the river by 2015.

R: [DOE] A large amount of work was planned for completion by 2015 that did not include additional, unanticipated work discovered during cleanup.

R: [EPA] If advice includes a note that schedules are set too far in the future, please point out which items and what the Board would have done differently. The rationales for schedules for the Canyon Areas were to finish cleanup at U-Plant first and complete the lower priority Canyon Areas after.

R: [Ecology] John Price noted that he would encourage the Budget and Contracts (BCC) Committee to consider the December 20, 2012 letter to Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget, Jeffrey Zients, signed by the western governors when producing advice.

Q: If the Board adopts advice on the change package and the 324 building at its February Board meeting, which is outside the public comment period, will the TPA agencies still accept the advice as formal comment?

R: Yes, the advice would be accepted as formal comment even without modifying the public comment period.

Committee members discussed components of potential advice, including items for the background and a single advice point regarding the 324 building:

- The HAB supports the TPA.
- The milestones are slipping, and the HAB is concerned that some of the milestones are still target dates and not milestones.
- This change package reflects a more realistic approach.
- Safe and effective cleanup is the first priority.
- Unknown components of cleanup emerge that require additional needs and funding.

- Request for additional funding for 324 building on the grounds that it represents a safety risk to the public.
- Examples of safety and risk to the public.
- Surveillance and maintenance costs that would be avoided if 324 building cleanup were to take place sooner.
- 324 building cleanup is crucial to moving forward with the 2015 Vision.

The committee agreed to draft advice on this topic. Pam Larsen is the lead issue manager on this topic. Pam, Dale Engstrom, Shelley Cimon, and Susan Leckband will author the advice. Draft advice will be distributed to the committee for review and consideration for consensus via email prior to the February Board meeting.

100 F/IU Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A and 100 D/H Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A

Agency Presentation

Jim Hansen (DOE-RL) provided an introduction/overview presentation for both the 100 F/IU Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A and 100 D/H Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A. In addition, he briefly discussed the River Corridor CERCLA decision documents. He noted that 100-K Area Proposed Plan (Rev. 0) is delayed for an unknown length of time and is not expected to go out for public comment for several months. DOE is working with EPA to develop a timeline to complete the document. John noted that any comments the HAB provides would be considered in Revision 0. The agencies will address public comments on Rev. 0 in the Responsiveness Summary, part of the ROD. Remedial design and a remedial action work plan will follow. There have been questions about cleanup levels. DOE has agreed to do a residential-based cleanup and is using State cleanup levels, revised in 2007. These mostly fall under the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Method B. As he noted, cleanup levels for rad can be calculated on dose or risk (new EPA guidance). DOE will use the lower of the two levels.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C: The Board appreciates being able to look at draft As and provide input at this stage of the process.

Q: The committee wants to understand K Area technical implementation needs and what the integration of K Area looks like. Is there agreement on contaminants of potential concern in K Area?

> *R: [DOE] The agencies are focusing in on common ground in developing these documents. 100 D/H Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A is the first Ecology regulatory lead document. DOE will have to work through changes in format. The 100-N Area documents will be delayed.*

Agency Presentation

Jim Hanson, DOE-RL, provided a presentation specific to 100 D/H Proposed Plan Draft A. Historically the hexavalent chromium plume concentrations in proximity to the river were 2-300 ppb in H area and up to 1,000 ppb in D area. These levels were the basis to take interim action to protect the river, aquatic organisms and shut off the flux of contamination. Interim pump-and-treat systems and in situ redox manipulation were used to address these groundwater plumes. Recently, new, expanded pump-and-treat

facilities were built in HX and DH areas that have been successful and significantly decreased the chromium plume along with strontium and nitrates.

In addition, DOE is addressing the sources of contamination and provided several photos showing deep excavation of hexavalent chromium waste sites. DOE believes hexavalent chromium contamination is very deep, especially around the transfer station and a tank near a French drain in the D area. They may need to excavate to groundwater - eighty-five feet below the surface.

Today there are limited areas where the groundwater plumes exceed the river protection standard and can be seen in the plume map where the plume is touching the shoreline. Additional work is needed to protect those areas. The 100-D/H RI/FS/PP (Draft A) evaluates the alternatives to address that contamination. Below are the four alternatives evaluated in the proposed plan:

1. No Action
2. Removal, Treatment and Disposal (RTD) and Void Fill Grouting for one Waste Site and Pump and Treat with Biological Treatment for Groundwater
3. RTD and Void Fill Grouting for one Waste Site and Increased Pump and Treat for Groundwater
4. RTD Waste Sites and Pump and Treat for Groundwater

(Alternates 2, 3, and 4 have the common elements of monitored Natural Attenuation and Institutional Controls.)

Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: What are the hexavalent chromium levels that are going into the river?

> *R: [DOE] The current groundwater plume map shows a few areas where the river protection standard of 10 ug/l hexavalent chromium entering the river is exceeded and where the plume intersects the shoreline. The actions being proposed would address those areas and remove contaminant mass inland from the shoreline. The levels of hexavalent chromium going into the river are ten parts per billion.*
>
> *As part of the of the interim action for the former HR-3 OU pump and treat, DOE had to reload resin about every three weeks; the former DR-5 system required on-site regeneration of resins weekly and was a costly process. For new DX and HX systems, DOE decided to use a resin used by EPA at a chrome plating facility in Vancouver, WA. This resin needs to be changed out every 2 years instead of every three weeks. The first resin change out is planned for February or March 2013. Upon resin depletion, the resin will be stabilized if necessary, and disposed of at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).*

Q: [DOE-Headquarters (HQ)] Steven Golian, (DOE-HQ), commented that Alternative 2 when compared to Alternative 3 would take twice as long to restore groundwater but would save sixty-four million dollars. This groundwater will not be used. In general, does the committee place a higher priority on cleaning up the groundwater sooner even if there will be no access to it and no plans to use it?

> *R: Jean Vanni noted that Yakama Nation expects groundwater to be cleaned to unrestricted use. The Yakama Nation has treaty rights to the groundwater.*

C: I agree with Alternative 3 out of the four alternatives. I am concerned about chromium getting into the river. There are organisms that cannot withstand any amount of chromium contamination. Alternative 2 uses biological treatment for groundwater, which is the same biological treatment for groundwater that grows bacteria and tries to revert by reduction the chromium moving through the ground. It was found to be somewhat effective, but I am not in favor of that. I support installing additional wells. Pump and treat has proven to clean up the groundwater most effectively and can do so over a period of twelve years, which is a relatively short amount of time. I would like to see a tested effective method for installing a permeable reactive barrier to treat the strontium.

R: [DOE] Strontium is in close proximity to the river. The concentrations are relatively low, but they do exceed the threshold for groundwater. DOE is co-extracting hexavalent chromium, strontium 90 and nitrate to remain very low. In a couple of years, we will have better information on chromium effects on fish from some new studies being done. The concentrations found in the water may be lower than levels at which biological effects occur NRTC is conducting studies and showing similar lower rates.

Q: Are the cost values shown in Draft A present value numbers?

R: [DOE] The cost values presented in Draft A are present values numbers.

Q: Why does pump and treat for chromium decrease concentrations of strontium?

R: Dale Engstrom noted that according to Draft A, pump and treat for chromium gives strontium time to decay and strontium concentration gets diluted.

Q: How much strontium is there?

R: [DOE] There are low amounts of strontium, 20-30 picocuries/liter.

C: DOE has chosen to use institutional controls, such as fences and monitored natural attenuation (MNA). The committee would much rather see a pump and treat system. The difference between alternatives three and four is that the alternative three only treats the second half of the plume. Nothing is being done about the strontium plume. It is a low-level plume, but it is still an issue. Strontium is mobile, and applying a permeable barrier might be a good way to treat it.

Q: Are the committee's comments appropriate, and do they make a difference?

R: [Ecology] The committee's input is important so that when Ecology produces Revision 0, Ecology already has the committee's perspective. Big picture ideas are important for Ecology to consider at this stage of the process.

R: [Revision 0 is expected during the 2014 fiscal year.

C: I struggle with alternative two because some of the technology proposed is suspect.

C: [DOE-HQ] DOE is concerned with what may happen to Hanford Site given Congress' focus on addressing budget issues. Every other site has been hit with funding cuts. This could be a major problem for Hanford Site in the future.

C: The State of Oregon and the Tribes will provide formal comment on Draft A.

R: [DOE] DOE does not provide responses to Draft A comments. Committee members were encouraged to work with and submit comments to the regulators.

Agency Presentation

Greg Sinton, DOE-RL, provided a presentation specific to 100 F/IU Draft A Proposed Plan Overview. Greg noted that under the interim remedial action ROD, approximately 1.5 million tons of waste have been removed from 100-F, 100-F has been re-vegetated, and two square miles of former reactor industrial park have been remediated. In addition, DOE removed approximately an estimated 500,000 tons of waste materials at100-IU-2/IU-6. Approximately 36 remaining waste sites are expected to be remediated after the Record of Decision is issued.

Greg briefly presented the 100-F/OU vadose zone remedial and the groundwater alternatives evaluated in the proposed plan.

Vadose Zone Alternatives

1. S-1: No Action
2. S-2: Removal, Treatment and Disposal

Groundwater Alternatives

1. No Action;
2. GW2: Institutional Controls and Monitored Natural Attenuation
3. GW3: Pump and Treat Optimized with other Technologies (specifically *in situ* treatment by adding a substrate to encourage biological activity)
4. GW 4: Enhanced Pump and Treat

Greg noted that the preferred alternative for the vadose zone (soil) is alternative S-2: Remove, Treat and Dispose (RTD), because it is protective of human health and the environment, complies with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), is cost effective and utilizes permanent solutions, and is readily implementable as demonstrated through interim action ROD activities. Greg noted that the preferred alternative for Groundwater is GW-2: ICs and Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA). This alternative was selected, because the conditions do not currently present an actual risk to human or ecological receptors since groundwater is not being used and contaminant concentrations reaching the river are low, it achieves cleanup within a timeframe comparable to other alternatives, and the vadose zone sources of the observed contamination have been remediated via RTD.

Regulator Perspective

Larry Gadbois, EPA, noted that in order to be protective throughout the river, DOE must return groundwater with the maximum efficiency. Larry thought that DOE may struggle with this policy issue.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C: I do not think anyone is happy with Alternative 2; do not agree with it. I disagree with the comparative evaluation of the short-term effectiveness for the groundwater alternatives. Alternative 3 and 4 do not address the strontium plume (mobile); know it is low, but would like DOE to look at a permeable reactive

barrier. It will take a long time to attenuate this problem. Look to remove Cs, Sr, Am and Eu in the vadose zone at sites where current levels will take time to decay below direct contract risk levels. Removing these contaminants would solve a large problem and shorten MNA time.

The committee thanked the presenters for preparing presentations and answering questions. The committee agreed to continue issue manager tracking for this topic. Dale Engstrom, lead issue manager, will compile comments from interested committee members and share them with the regulators. DOE will respond to the regulators' comments on the draft document. Pam noted that given that this is a Draft A, she would not suggest that the committee produce any advice yet. Susan Leckband suggested a short letter regarding the 100 D/H Proposed Plan Draft A. Susan proposed to send the letter around for RAP consensus. There was no consensus to do so.

Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS) (joint with PIC)

Issue Manager Framing and Report-Out

Dale Engstrom introduced the framing discussion regarding the Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM FEIS). He noted that RAP requested having a framing discussion on its agenda today (in addition to the framing discussion on the Tank Waste Committee agenda) to ensure there is time to address issues of specific concern to RAP.

Liz Mattson reviewed the work and process to date that the issue manager team (comprised of members of several committees) has undertaken and followed and what the committee is doing during today's framing discussion. A webinar was held in December where DOE provided introductory information about the final EIS. Following the webinar, issue managers held two calls and developed a set of framing questions that will help shape the Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting that was proposed to the Executive Issues Committee and subsequently scheduled for January 23. The purpose of the discussion today is to get feedback from the committee on the framing questions and the issue managers' proposed path forward. The framing questions will then be reviewed and discussed at tomorrow's TWC meeting, as will the path forward for the COTW meeting. Liz noted that at this time, the issue managers see a need for advice on how the final EIS will be used to make decisions (e.g. RODs).

Liz noted that the committee is also looking at DOE's response to HAB's Comments (advice). Those responses can be found in the TC&WM FEIS (Volume 2, Section 3) on the DOE website. She noted that the page numbers on the paper version of the document differ from the page numbers on the electronic version. HAB comments can be found on electronic version pages 375 – 406. Liz noted that it would be useful for committee members to review the response to comments in advance of the COTW meeting.

Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, noted that the issue managers are recommending that the COTW consist of an educational/informational component for the first half of the meeting and advice development for the second half. The issue managers are proposing that advice be developed and considered at the February Board meeting.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C: DOE did a remarkable job responding to HAB comments on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

C: The Hanford Communities plan to produce an educational television program about the TC & WM FEIS, which will include a filmed portion of the COTW meeting. The public is invited to the COTW, and there will be a huge range in knowledge.

C: The HAB would like a presentation from DOE at the COTW meeting to include responses to the proposed framing questions. A presentation like this would be a useful summary tool for the public. It is important to provide information to those members of the public who will not read the EIS appendix. A primary purpose of the COTW is for the committees to develop advice on how the final EIS will be used to develop RODs, before those RODs are issued. There are no public comment opportunities on RODs under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It is important for the Board to provide input before RODs are issued. There is no public process in place to express discontent with the final EIS other than to write advice.

> *R: [Ecology] Madeleine Brown noted that many of the decisions put forth in the final EIS will go into the permit issued by the State, and the HAB will have an opportunity to comment on the permit.*

C: After the final EIS is released, there is a 30-day waiting period before a ROD can be issued. There are RODs in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process, and there are also RODs in the NEPA process. The RODs in the CERCLA process are based on proposed plans that go out for public comment. RODs in the NEPA process, however, do not go out for public comment.

C: It would be nice for the committee to have a schedule of any future RODs.

Q: What is Ecology's role as a cooperating agency, and is Ecology willing to support holding back issuing a ROD?

> *R: [Ecology] You can expect Ecology to answer questions like this at the COTW.*

C: If there are major policy or analysis errors in the RODs under the NEPA process, legal action is the mechanism for challenging this. The best available information must be satisfied under NEPA. The question for RODs under the NEPA process becomes, "were these decisions made with the best available information?"

> *R: [DOE] Carrie Meyer, U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), noted that DOE's uncertainty about what the Board is looking for or the need to brief the Board on the final EIS stems from the fact that all of the answers to the framing questions can be found in the final EIS. DOE provided information during the webinar for how to find information within the document.*
>
> *R: [EPA] Larry Gadbois noted that the final EIS is a disclosure document, and it is unlikely that DOE will say anything that has not already been printed, given the risk of lawsuit.*

C: A save-the-date for the COTW meeting was sent out to Board members. It is unlikely that members of the public will attend the COTW. It is important to consider whether or not the COTW will be comprised of just those individuals who were involved in the topic over the past few months.

C: The committee should consider a sounding board at the February Board meeting in lieu of a COTW. This will still inform the public of the issues the HAB is concerned about.

> *R: [Ecology] Madeleine Brown noted that sounding boards do not require response, but that advice does require a response.*

C: I am not sure what the purpose of the COTW will be. The HAB has limited opportunity to have COTW meetings, and it is important to consider whether or not the HAB wants to use budget on a COTW meeting for this topic.

C: The framing questions are interesting, and the energy committee members and issue managers have put into the topic is extraordinary. The February timeframe is too short to produce quality advice. This does not detract from the value of the conversations, but the framing questions could be answered in advance of the February Board meeting (e.g. during committee meetings).

Committee members expressed mixed feelings on the need to learn more about the final EIS and whether the Board should spend time looking at the final document too closely. While committee members generally felt it was important to have some kind of educational summary document/presentation for members of the public who would not be able to read through the final EIS or the Appendix, some committee members thought it would not be important to touch on the differences between what is in the final EIS and what was in the draft EIS.

Comments made in favor of identifying the differences between the draft and final EIS at the COTW include that the HAB spent substantial resources reviewing and commenting on what changes they wanted in the final EIS. If the changes to the document are not understood, it will be difficult to understand the impacts of future documents. It would be most efficient if DOE, who wrote the document and knows what the substantive changes are, to communicate them to the Board and public in a summary fashion. Comments made against using a COTW to discuss the differences between the draft and final EIS included that it would be more productive and efficient to look forward rather than back.

The committee reviewed and tracked changes to the proposed framing questions. The TWC will discuss this topic at its meeting tomorrow. RAP members were encouraged to attend. Issue managers agreed to meet with DOE in advance of the COTW to discuss the framing questions and engage in technical discussions. Committee members agreed that it is difficult to review the 9,000 page final EIS in 30 days. Dale volunteered to review and compile DOE's responses to HAB advice regarding the EIS.

Committee Business

Update the 3-Month Work Plan

The committee updated the 3-month work plan. The committee decided to hold a framing discussion on groundwater modeling, consistency and methodology and transport as a joint topic with TWC in February. The committee agreed to discuss the following topics in February: 2015 Vision and beyond, land transition between programs and contractors and 300 Area Final Proposed Plan and RI/FS.

For March, the committee would like to have a groundwater modeling tutorial and discuss deep vadose zone remediation technologies, receive a regulator briefing on regulator comments on the 100 F/IU Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A and the 100 D/H Operable Unite Proposed Plan Draft A, receive an update on the 618-19/11 Vertical Pipe Unit, and discuss the ROD resulting from the TC & WM FEIS (if one is issued) as a joint topic with TWC.

For April, the committee would like to receive a briefing on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and Remedial Action Work Plan and tentatively planned to receive an update on funding and mortgage cost. The committee agreed no committee calls are needed in January.

Complete the February Potential Meeting Topics Table

The committee completed the February Potential Meeting Topics Table to frame up the February committee meeting, capture new framing questions, update issues, and included new issue managers for topics as appropriate.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 2: February Potential Meeting Topics Table
Attachment 3: RAP 3-Month Work Plan
Attachment 4: Proposed Changes to Tri-Party Agreement 100 Area Waste Site Cleanup, 300 Area Surplus Facilities, Central Plateau Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies and Canyon Facilities Cleanup Milestones Presentation
Attachment 5: Introduction to 100-D/H and 100-F/IU Draft A Proposed Plans Overview Presentation
Attachment 6: 100-D/H Draft A Proposed Plan Overview Presentation
Attachment 7: 100-F/IU Draft A Proposed Plan Overview Presentation
Attachment 8: Preliminary framing questions for the TPA agencies regarding information the HAB would like presented at the proposed January COTW

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Richard Bloom	Pam Larsen	Dan Serres
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Dick Smith
Dale Engstrom	Vince Panesko (phone)	Bob Suyama
Norma Jean Germond	Maynard Plahuta	Gene Van Liew
John Howieson (phone)	Ed Revell	Jean Vanni
Steve Hudson	Liz Mattson	

Others

Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Nick Ceto, Ceto Environmental
Jonathan Dowell, DOE-RL	Nina Menard, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
Mark French, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Theresa Labriola, Columbia Riverkeeper
Jim Hansen, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Jim Hanson, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Ted Repasky, CTUIR
Greg Sinton, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Reed Kaldor, MSA
K. Michael Thompson, DOE-RL		Barbara Wise, MSA
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP		Bruce Ford, PRC
Tifany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Jeff Lerch, WCH

Tom Rogers, DOH		Mark McKenna, WCH
Steven Golian, DOE-HQ		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
Alex Teimouri, DOE-HQ		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues

COTW

- IM framing of prior HAB advice & agency response – Dale
- History/Overview component, Board's involvement with draft advice
- Technical research by IMs with DOE about what changed from draft to final – Jean

Page 1

TC & WM EIS

- New potential proposal – Sounding Board instead of COTW advice?
    - Will discuss @ TWC 1/9/2013

Page 2

---

100 – D/H Draft A Proposed Plan

- ECY Comments back to DOE in mid-February – Dale & Jean
- Rev. 0 next Fiscal Year? End of 2013?
- Continued IM tracking
    - Policy question: How much money to spend to accelerate cleanup? (also for 100 F I/U)

Page 3

---

100 F I/U Draft A Proposed Plan

- Rev. 0 timeframe: Calendar year 2013
    - Policy question: How much money to spend to accelerate cleanup?
- IM tracking – Dale & Jean

Page 4

TPA Change Package Follow Up

- Advice for February
    - 324 building
        - Unknowns popped up requiring additional needs & funding
        - Poses safety risk to public
        - Request additional funding for 324 building
        - Critical to river cleanup & 2015 Vision
    - Background
        - Board supports TPA
        - ID concern about general milestone slippage & "target date"
        - Good to see "reality" shown in this Change Package
        - Goal – safe & effective cleanup is first priority
    - February advice will be accepted as a comment without an extension to comment period – commitment by TPA agency)
    - Authors – Pam, Dale, Susan & Shelley

Page 5

February (work planning)

- Groundwater modeling – framing discussion to frame up a tutorial from DOE
- Land transition between programs and contractors (e.g. WCH → PRC), not legacy management (presentation)
- Presentation on 2015 Vision and beyond, clarifying scope (informational)
- 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan Rev. 0 (joint w/ PIC)
- Possible placeholder on TWC agenda for joint topic regarding the TC&WM FEIS
- WESF – HSEP lead, joint w/ RAP/TWC

Page 6

March (work planning)

- Deep vadose zone technologies
- Regulator briefing update on their comments on 100 D/H & 100 F I/U Draft As
- Update 618-10/11 Vertical Pipe Unit (20 min)
- ROD resulting from TC & WM FEIS
- Groundwater Modeling tutorial

Page 6

April (work planning)

- Briefing on PFP & Remedial Action Work Plan
- U-Canyon
    - Update on funding and mortgage cost
    - Joint with BCC

Page 7
